

REMARKS

The present response is intended to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

In this application, claims 27-36 are currently pending. Claims 1-26 have been cancelled. In the present response, claims 27 and 32 are amended. Claims 28-31 and 33-36 are unchanged.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 17-18 and 24-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bell (U.S. Published Patent Application No. 20050280502). Bell describes a system and method for obtaining information relating to a person without face-to-face, verbal or other contact.

Applicant expresses his appreciation to Examiner Khai M. Nguyen and SPE Joseph Feild for the courtesy of an interview, which was granted to Applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held in the USPTO on November 27, 2006. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

In the interview, the patentability of pending claims 27 and 32 were discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of Bell. The Interview Summary Record states, in relevant part, "Regarding claims 27 and 32, Examiner's amendment to clarify that map is visually sensible."

In order to facilitate allowance of this case, Applicant has amended claims 27 and 32 as agreed upon at the interview to include the recitation "a mobile communicator location functionality for providing a visually sensible map indicating the relative locations of a plurality of said mobile communicators in a space." Support for the amendment to claims 27 and 32 is found, inter alia, in Fig. 4 and in paragraph [0060] of the application as filed and as published.

Neither Bell nor any of the other prior art of record, alone or in combination, show or suggest providing a visually sensible map indicating relative locations of a plurality of mobile communicators, employing a mobile communicator of a second user to receive the map and designating a location on the map of a first user, as recited in amended claims 27 and 32.

As discussed hereinabove and in the interview, the introductions system of independent claim 27 is not shown or suggested by the prior art and is deemed patentable. Claims 28-31 depend directly or ultimately from claim 27 and recite additional patentable subject matter and therefore are deemed patentable. The introductions method if independent claim 32 is not shown or suggested by the prior art and is deemed patentable. Claims 33-36 depend directly or ultimately from claim 32 and recite additional patentable subject matter and therefore are deemed patentable.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CLIFFORD J. MASS
LADAS & PARRY LLP
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO.30,086(212)708-1890